

# The Transverse Quark Distribution and Proton Electromagnetic Form Factors in Skew Distribution Formalism

John P. Ralston<sup>a</sup>, Pankaj Jain<sup>b</sup> and Roman V. Buniy<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA*

<sup>b</sup> *Physics Department, I.I.T. Kanpur, India 208016*

**Abstract.** Skew density matrices can be diagonalized to yield probability interpretation. The power-counting prediction of perturbative QCD is found consistent with recent CEBAF data on  $F_2(Q^2)/F_1(Q^2)$ .

Perturbative *QCD* can be applied to hard exclusive processes in many ways. Use of “skew” or “off-diagonal” parton distributions [1] has generated attention. Skew distributions are matrix elements sharing features with density matrices. The diagonal elements of a positive density matrix are interpreted as probabilities. Density matrices depend on the basis: probability in one frame will appear to be an interference of amplitudes in another frame. This occurs with quark spin amplitudes [2], where transverse polarization (“transversity”) distributions appear as interference in the helicity basis, and helicity distributions appear as interference in the transverse polarization basis.

Here we find a probabilistic interpretation for skew distributions involved in the proton electromagnetic form factors. Then a simple, kinematic angular momentum argument resolve a recent puzzle from data for the electromagnetic form factors  $F_1(Q^2), F_2(Q^2)$ . For about 30 years it was thought that  $F_2(Q^2)/F_1(Q^2) \sim 1/Q^2$  was a prediction of hard scattering, and in particular, of *pQCD*. We made the same prediction on the basis of skew distributions in 1993 [3]. Recent *CEBAF* data [4] shows that  $F_2/F_1 \sim 1/\sqrt{|Q^2|}$ . Our prediction missed some instructive points, and the *CEBAF* result is expected, if proper kinematics is simply taken into account.

*Diagonalization:* Consider  $2 \rightarrow 2$  quark-proton scattering with momentum transfer  $\Delta^\mu, \Delta^2 < 0$ . The proton is described by states  $|p - \Delta/2, s\rangle$  coming “in” and  $|p + \Delta/2, s'\rangle$  going “out”. The scattering matrix element is

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{\alpha,\beta}^{s,s'}(p; k, k', \Delta) \delta(k + p - k' - p - \Delta) \\ &= \int d^4z d^4z' \exp(-ikz + ik'z') \langle p - \Delta/2, s | \psi_\beta(z) \bar{\psi}_\alpha(z') | p + \Delta/2, s' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\alpha, \beta$  are Dirac indices of the quark fields  $\psi$ , and the in- and out-quarks have momenta  $k, k'$  with  $k = x(p - \Delta/2) + \vec{k}_T$ ,  $k' = x'(p + \Delta/2) + \vec{k}'_T$ . A time-ordering symbol is dropped, as only one time ordering contributes: see Diehl and Gousset [1]. Now  $\Phi(\Delta)$  can be decomposed into terms symmetric and antisymmetric in  $\Delta$ ; the symmetric part is Hermitian. This leads to a density matrix we can diagonalize.

To diagonalize we make a series of coordinate transformations. Make a Lorentz transformation to the frame:  $p = (p^+, 0, m^2/2p^+)$ ;  $\Delta = (0, \Delta_T, -t/2p^+)$ ;  $\Delta_T^2 = -t$ . Now  $\Delta^\mu$  becomes entirely transverse as  $p^+ \rightarrow \infty$ . The partons have 4-vectors  $k^\mu = xp^\mu + k_T^\mu$ ,  $x(p + \Delta)^\mu + k_T'^\mu$ , yielding

$$x = x'; \quad k'_T = k_T + \Delta_T(1 - x).$$

The matrix element is now diagonal in  $x$ . This might seem impossible, because the  $x, x'$  dependence of skew distributions is thought to be invariant: but  $x$  is not Lorentz-invariant sideways. The convolution in  $\vec{k}_T$  is diagonalized by conjugate transverse spatial coordinates  $\vec{b}$ . Then  $\int d^2b \Phi(s, s'; \vec{b}/(1-x), x) e^{i\vec{b} \cdot \vec{\Delta}}$  can be inverted by Fourier transform to find the integrand, diagonal in everything but spin, which also can be made diagonal by familiar helicity or transverse bases.

The choice of frames and diagonalization was used in an independent early introduction of off-diagonal distributions [3]. Due to a kinematics goof we missed the factor  $1/(1-x)$ . A review by Brodsky and Lepage [5] was useful.

*Interpretation:* The electromagnetic form factors (with  $-Q^2 = \Delta_T^2$ ) are found by following the Feynman rules, which includes multiplication by the quark charge  $e_q$ , tracing  $\Phi$  with  $\gamma^\mu$ , and doing the integral  $\int dx d^2b$ . At large  $-Q^2$  this is dominated by  $b^2 \sim 1/|Q^2|$  by Fourier analysis. The “short distance” implied by large  $Q$  is far more general than the more problematic “quark-counting” argument. We simply have *one* quark located by the hard momentum  $Q$ , while the asymptotic short distance theory [5] assumes that *all possible Fock states* are separated by asymptotically short distance. We remain within the framework of  $pQCD$ , of course, while choosing a more general factorization method.

Since the form factor  $F_1(Q^2)$  is known from data, we invert the Fourier transform to solve for a positive-definite diagonal element of the density matrix, namely a probability:

$$P(\lambda, \lambda; \vec{b}) = \frac{1}{e_q^2} \int d^2Q_T e^{-i\vec{b} \cdot \vec{Q}_T} F_1(Q^2). \quad (1)$$

Positivity is assured because  $F_1(Q^2)$  is monotonically decreasing. The quantity  $P(\lambda, \lambda; \vec{b})$  is on a similar footing to the usual parton distributions. Indeed, the usual parton distributions are functions of  $x$  integrated over  $k_T$ , while  $P(b)$  depends on  $b = |\vec{b}|$  and has been integrated over  $x$ .

A fit to the Fourier transform of  $F_1(Q^2)$  has been performed. A profile of the transverse  $(1/(1-x)$ -weighted) probability to find a quark (mostly of the up-type) was shown at the meeting. We expect that this invariant quantity will be useful in many studies involving the transverse coordinate.

*Orbital Angular Momentum:* Quark orbital angular momentum is a fascinating subject of great interest in the proton spin puzzle. In the case at hand, we are lucky to have two quarks evaluated at the same  $x, \vec{b}$  points, so that difficulties of gauge invariance are minimal. Indeed,  $P(b)$  is gauge invariant by definition in terms of observable quantities.

We expand the operators in terms of solutions to  $\nabla^2\psi = 0$ . By usual methods [2] the operators are evaluated inside the proton state, letting the correlation  $\Phi$  be expressed by  $c$ -number “wave functions”. Partons are below threshold in a form factor, so we need an expansion for orbital angular momentum for spacelike  $k$ :

$$\psi(z^-, \vec{b}, z^+ = 0) = \sum_n \int dx \psi_n(x) I_n(b) e^{-in\phi} e^{ixp^+ z^-}. \quad (2)$$

Here  $e^{-in\phi}$  are light-cone  $SO(2)$  orbital angular momentum basis functions;  $I_n(b)$  are modified Bessel functions more usually seen as  $J_n(b)$  for a timelike basis.<sup>1</sup> We are interested in the  $F_2$  form factor, associated with  $i\sigma_{\mu\nu}Q^\nu/2m$ , which represents proton helicity-flip at large  $Q^2$ . Since we cannot change the helicity of a quark with a hard scattering (the near-perfect chiral symmetry of  $pQCD$ ), the proton can only flip its spin to make  $F_2$  by transferring a unit of *orbital* angular momentum in the quark [3]. (Hoodbhoy and Ji [6] subsequently verified the same result.)

Note we are not attempting here to derive the functional dependence of  $P(\lambda, \lambda; \vec{b})$ : in our approach this comes from data. Our approach is to relate each power of  $b$  or angular momentum to further suppression by powers of  $1/Q$ . The argument for short distance is kinematically compelling here (if controversial in the quark-counting method), so for large  $Q$  the Fourier transform is dominated by  $I_0(b) \sim b^0$  if this channel is allowed. But  $I_0(b)$  represents the s-wave component, with zero angular momentum, and so this channel is open only to the helicity non-flip, namely

$$F_1 \sim \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \int dx d^2b \bar{\psi}_0(x) \Gamma \psi_0(x) [I_0(b/(1-x))]^2 \exp(i\vec{Q}_T \cdot \vec{b}). \quad (3)$$

Here  $\Gamma$  represents the necessary Dirac matrices.

Conversely, the only possibility for the helicity-flip  $F_2$  is to use powers of  $b$  to conserve the angular momentum, and suffer the corresponding power-suppression in  $Q$ . On the basis of this power counting, it was reasoned [3] that by angular momentum selection rules, the integrals over  $b$  would vanish unless two representations of the same angular momentum matched up, giving the previous prediction  $F_2(Q^2)/F_1(Q^2) \sim 1/Q^2$  for  $Q^2 > GeV^2$ . Now consulting the formulas this is simply not true. There is a factor of  $e^{i\vec{Q}_T \cdot \vec{b}_T}$  carrying angular momentum:

$$F_2 \sim \delta_{\lambda, -\lambda'} \int dx d^2b \bar{\psi}_0(x) \Gamma \psi_1(x) I_0(b/(1-x)) I_1(b/(1-x)) e^{i|Q_T|b \cos(\phi - \phi_Q)} e^{i\phi} + cc. \quad (4)$$

---

<sup>1)</sup> If one is concerned about  $b \rightarrow \infty$ , then Green functions can be expanded in series of  $I_n(b_<)K_n(b_>)$  where  $b_<(b_>)$  is the smaller (larger) of two  $b$  arguments. We only need short distance.

Physically, the probe  $\vec{Q}$  breaks the rotational symmetry of the problem.

We reiterate that this analysis is entirely within the context of  $pQCD$ . In  $pQCD$  one takes some matrix elements from the data, and makes predictions for others. What can we predict here? From the power-counting cited, we have

$$\frac{F_2(Q^2)}{F_1(Q^2)} = \frac{\langle \bar{\psi}_1(x)\psi_0(x) \rangle}{\sqrt{|Q^2|} \langle b\bar{\psi}_0(x)\psi_0(x) \rangle}, \quad (5)$$

where the braces represent the integrals. The fact that  $(Q/GeV)F_2(Q^2)/F_1(Q^2)$  is not far from unity in the CEBAF data indicates that the proton wave functions for quark angular momenta 1 and 0 are not too different in magnitude. Constituent quark, or non-relativistic models are ruled out, but those models were never capable of capturing the Fock space description of the skew distribution. It will be interesting to continue these studies in the context of the larger proton spin puzzle.

**Acknowledgments:** Work supported by DOE grant number DE-FGO2-98ER41079.

## REFERENCES

1. J. Bartles, Zeit. Phys. C **12** (1982) 263; B. Geyer et al, Zeit. Phys. C **26** (1985) 521; T. Braunschweig et al, Zeit. Phys. C **33** (1987) 521; F. Dittes et al, Phys. Lett. B **209** (1988) 325; I. Balitsky and V. Braun, Nucl. Phys. B **311** (1989) 1541; P. Jain, J. P. Ralston and B. Pire, Proceedings of the DPF92 meeting, Fermilab, November 10-14 (1992), hep-ph/9212243; X. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 7114; A. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. B **380** (1996) 417; Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 5524; M. Diehl and T. Gousset, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 359 (1998).
2. J. P. Ralston and D. E. Soper, Nucl. Phys. B **152**, 109 (1979).
3. P. Jain and J. P. Ralston, *Future Directions in Particle and Nuclear Physics at Multi-GeV Hadron Beam Facilities* Proceedings of the Workshop held at BNL, 4-6 March, 1993, hep-ph/9305250.
4. M. K. Jones et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** 1398 (2000).
5. S. J. Brodsky and G. P. Lepage, *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, Ed. by A.H. Mueller, World Scientific, 1989.
6. P. Hoodbhoy and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 740 (1996).